



OKD007221831

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555

Docket No. 40-7580

DEC 2 1991

RECEIVED
SUPERFUND

APR 15 1991

RECORDS
CENTER

Mr. John J. Hunter
Corporate Manager of Process
Engineering and Facilities Construction
Fansteel Metals
Number Ten Tantalum Place
Muskogee, Oklahoma 74401

Dear Mr. Hunter:

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff has completed its review of the revised Remedial Assessment Work Plan, dated February 1991, for the Fansteel site at Muskogee to determine if the issues and concerns raised in the comments enclosed with Mr. Charles Haughney's November 21, 1990, letter to you have been satisfactorily resolved. The staff has also reviewed the revised conceptual Decommissioning Plan, dated February 1991, which you stated in your letter of January 9, 1991, addressed the NRC staff's concerns on adequate worker radiation protection and radiological characterization of the site.

We find that you have satisfactorily resolved all the concerns on hydrogeology, but have not resolved satisfactorily or fully the concerns on the radiological characterization of the site and facilities therein.

Our primary remaining concern is to assure that the radioactive contamination measurement techniques you employ are adequate, and produce results comparable to results from the measurements we will make in our confirmatory surveys. We recommend that you coordinate with our survey contractor, Oak Ridge Associated Universities' (ORAU's) Environmental Survey and Site Assessment Program, to assure comparability. Your response to Comment No. 13 of the Oklahoma State Department of Health shows that you understand the potential disequilibrium of the uranium and thorium decay product chains that is the basis of our concern.

Our comments on the revised Remedial Assessment Work Plan and the conceptual Decommissioning Plan are enclosed for your consideration. We would appreciate receiving your responses to these comments in replacement page revisions of the plans promptly. Your conceptual Decommissioning Plan provides valuable support to your Remedial Assessment Work Plan and is acceptable in that function. However, your proposed method for disposal of soil contaminated with 10 to 50 pCi source material per gram of soil remains an unresolved issue.

Mr. John J. Hunter

2

To facilitate the review process, we will be happy to meet with you and your staff and consultants to discuss our comments after you have looked them over. At the same meeting, we also want to discuss our concerns regarding your Work Plan for Ponds Nos. 6, 7, 8, and 9 Closure Investigation that was transmitted with your letter dated October 24, 1991, to Mr. Dave Dillon of the Oklahoma Water Resources Board and to me for review, as well as the concerns and issues resulting from our inspection of your facility in April 1991.

If you have any questions about the enclosed comments and if you wish to schedule and coordinate the meeting to discuss them, please contact Dr. Tin Mo, the NRC Licensing Project Manager, at (301) 492-0570.

Sincerely,



Jerry J. Swift, Section Leader
Advanced Fuel and Special
Facilities Section
Fuel Cycle Safety Branch
Division of Industrial and
Medical Nuclear Safety
Office of Nuclear Material Safety
and Safeguards

Enclosures: As stated

cc: JHarrick, Earth Sciences Consultants, Inc. (ESC)
PTaylor, ESC
WKemp, Oklahoma State Department of Health
BDriscoll, USEPA, R-VI
DDillon, Oklahoma Water Resources Board